

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-33 remain pending. Claims 1, 7, 12, 20, and 27 are independent.

**INTERVIEW CONDUCTED**

Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicants' representative on July 26, 2005.

**§ 102 REJECTION – MAO**

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 12, 14-17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Mao et al. (US Publication 2003/0115612). See *Final Office Action item 4*. Applicants respectfully traverse.

For a Section 102 rejection to be proper, the cited reference must teach or suggest each and every claimed element. See *M.P.E.P. 2131; M.P.E.P. 706.02*. Thus, if the cited reference fails to teach or suggest one or more elements, then the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

In this instance, Mao fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed element. For example, independent claim 1 recites, in part "not performing the conversion of the data content if it is found that the data contents to be displayed are consistent with the current A/V signal." At the interview, the

Examiner indicated that Mao does not appear to teach or suggest this feature. For at least this reason, independent claim 1 is distinguishable over Mao.

Claim 7 also recites, in part, "not performing the conversion of the data content if it is found that the data contents to be displayed are consistent with the current A/V signal." Thus, for at least similar reasons, independent claim 7 is also distinguishable over Mao.

Independent claim 12 recites in part, "wherein if the A/V interface control unit judges that the data contents to be displayed are consistent with the current A/V signal ... the browser unit displays to the display unit the A/V signal and the data contents ... without performing the conversion of data." Again, the Examiner indicated such features not taught or suggested by Mao. Therefore, claim 12 is distinguishable over Mao.

Independent claim 20 recites in part, "taking no action to change the data contents if it is determined that the current data contents do correspond to the requested channel" and "taking no action to change the channel if it is determined that the current channel does correspond to the requested data content change." For similar reasons as discussed above, claim 20 is also distinguishable over Mao.

Claims 2-3, 6, 8, and 14-17 depend from independent claims 1, 7, or 12, directly or indirectly. Thus, for at least the reasons stated above with respect to independent claims 1, 7, or 12, these dependent claims are also

distinguishable over Mao. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-3, 6-8, 12, 14-17, and 20 based on Mao be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – MAO, KAPLAN

Claims 4, 5, 18, 19, 20, 22-27 and 29-33 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mao in further view of Kaplan (USP 6,058,430). Applicants respectfully traverse.

For a Section 103 rejection to be proper, a *prima facie* case of obviousness must be established. See *M.P.E.P. 2142*. One requirement to establish *prima facie case* of obviousness is that the prior art references, when combined, must teach or suggest all claim limitations. See *M.P.E.P. 2142; M.P.E.P. 706.02(j)*. Thus, if the cited references fail to teach or suggest one or more elements, then the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 4, 5, 18, and 19, it is noted that these claims depend from independent claims 1 or 12. It has been shown above that claims 1 and 12 are distinguishable over Mao. Kaplan has not been, and indeed cannot be relied upon to correct for at least the above noted deficiencies of Mao. Therefore, claims 1 and 12 are distinguishable over the combination of Mao and Kaplan. For at least due to the dependency thereon, claims 4, 5, 18, and 19 are also distinguishable over the combination of Mao and Kaplan.

Independent claim 20 recites in part, "taking no action to change the data contents if it is determined that the current data contents do correspond to the requested channel" and "taking no action to change the channel if it is determined that the current channel does correspond to the requested data content change." It has been shown above that Mao cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest at least this feature. Similarly, Kaplan cannot be upon to teach or suggest this feature as well. Therefore, independent claim 20 is distinguishable over the combination of Mao and Kaplan.

Claim 27 also recites features similar to claim 20. Therefore, independent claim 27 is also distinguishable over Mao and Kaplan.

Claims 22-26 and 29-33 depend from independent claims 20 and 27, directly or indirectly. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claims 20 and 27, these dependent claims are also distinguishable over the combination of Mao and Kaplan.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 4, 5, 18, 19, 20, 22-27, and 29-33 based on Mao and Kaplan be withdrawn.

#### § 103 REJECTION – MAO

Claims 9, 10, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 9, 10, and 13 depend from independent claims 7 and 12. It has been shown above that claims 7 and 12 are distinguishable over Mao. Therefore, for at least due to the dependency on claims 7 and 12, claims 9, 10, and 13, are also distinguishable over Mao.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 9, 10, and 13 based on Mao be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – MAO, SHOFF

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mao in view of Shoff (USP 6,240,555). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 11 depends from independent claim 7, and it has been shown above that claim 7 is distinguishable over Mao. Shoff has not been, and indeed cannot be, relied upon to teach at least the above noted deficiencies of Mao. Therefore, claim 7 is also distinguishable over the combination of Mao and Shoff.

For at least due to its dependency on claim 7, claim 11 is also distinguishable over the combination of Mao and Shoff.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 11 based on Mao and Shoff, be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – MAO, KAPLAN, SHOFF

Claims 21 and 28 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mao in view of Kaplan and Shoff. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 21 and 28 depend from independent claims 20 and 27, respectively. It has been shown above that claims 20 and 27 are distinguishable over Mao and Kaplan. Shoff has not been and indeed cannot be relied upon to correct for at least the above noted deficiencies of Mao and Kaplan. Therefore, claims 20 and 27 are distinguishable over the combination of Mao, Kaplan and Shoff. For at least due to the dependency thereon, claims 21 and 28 are also distinguishable over the combination of Mao, Kaplan and Shoff.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 21 and 28 based on Mao, Kaplan and Shoff be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Hyung Sohn (Reg.

U.S. Application No. 09/709,303

Docket No. 0630-1175P

Art Unit: 2611

Page 22 of 22

No. 44,346), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

**Date: September 6, 2005**

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH &, BIRCH, LLP

*HNS*  
EHC/HNS/ags  
0630-1175P

By: *Esther H. Chong*  
Esther H. Chong  
Reg. No. 40,953  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000